

Facesheet for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
 Agency: USFS - Inyo National Forest
 Application: General Application Requirements

6/2/2009

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700251

Agency Information

(Carefully read the instructions before completing this form)

1. Agency Information

- a. Agency Name USFS - Inyo National Forest
- b. Organizational Unit
- c. Address 351 Pacu Lane, Suite 200
- e. City Bishop State CA Zip 93514
- f. Federal Id Number 76-0873243 DUNS Number
- g. Agency fiscal year (beginning month and October-01 day)
- h. Agency Type (Please check one)
- ☐ City ☐ County ☒ U.S. Forest Service
- ☐ U.S. Forest Service - Patrol District ☐ U.S. Bureau of Land Management ☐ Other Federal Agency
- ☐ Federally Recognized Native American Tribe ☐ Educational Institution ☐ Nonprofit Organization - 501(c)(3) status only
- ☐ State Agency ☐ District

2. Project Information

- a. Project Name General Application Requirements
- b. Is implementing agency same as Agency (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No
- c. Implementing Agency Name
- d. Amount of Funds Requested Project Cost

Project Request(s) Summary

#	Project Type	Project Title	Grant Request	Match	Total Project Cost
1	G08-02-05-G01	Ground Operations and Maintenance - Forest	200,000	432,000	632,000
2	G08-02-05-G03	Ground Operations - Route Signing	77,000	123,000	200,000
3	G08-02-05-R01	Restoration - Forest Projects	206,000	100,000	306,000
4	G08-02-05-S01	Education & Safety	10,000	38,000	48,000
5		TOTAL	493,000	693,000	1,186,000

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____

APP # 700251

3. Contact

a. Authorized Representative

Name	Jim Upchurch				
Title	Forest Supervisor				
Mailing Address	351 Pacu Lane, Suite 200				
City	Bishop	State	CA	Zip	93514
Telephone	(760) 873-2550			Fax	
E-mail Address	jupchurch01@fs.fed.us				

b. Project Administrator

Name	Jeff Marsolais				
Title	Forest Recreation Officer				
Mailing Address	USDA Forest Service				
City	Bishop	State	CA	Zip	93514
Telephone	(760) 873-2515			Fax	
E-mail Address	jmarsolais@fs.fed.us				

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700251

A. Location Map

Attachments:

[General Location Map - Inyo NF](#)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700251

A. Equipment Inventory

Has your agency purchased any Equipment with OHV Trust Funds within the last five (5) years? (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

#	Item Description	Make	Model	Model Year	Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) or Serial Number	Project Agreement Number
1	Snowmobile-1200 miles	Arctic Cat	M7	2006	4UF06SNW46T119368	OR-2-I-82
2	ATV	Arctic Cat	700	2007	4WF07ATV57T216808	OR-2-I-82
3	Snowmobile Trailer	Trailer	2 place	2008	5PDCR14199R008218	G07-02-05-L01
4	Snowmobile Trailer	Trailer	2 place	2008	5PDCR14129R008111	G07-02-05-L01

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700251

PART 1 - ITEM 1. DETERMINE THE NEED FOR FULL FULL HABITAT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (HMP)

All Applicants submitting Projects involving Ground Disturbing Activities are subject to HMP requirements. The HMP must cover the combined Project Area of all proposed Projects with Ground Disturbing Activities.

Applicants able to certify that none of the proposed activities listed in the Application in areas open to legal OHV Recreation contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats shall submit only HMP Part 1. Applicants who cannot certify that the proposed activities listed in the Application in areas open to legal OHV Recreation do not contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats shall submit HMP Parts 1 and 2.

1. Do any of your proposed projects involve Ground Disturbing Activities? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)
2. Can the Applicant certify that none of the proposed Projects with Ground Disturbing Activities in areas open to legal OHV Recreation contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats? (If you checked 'Yes', you are done with HMP) (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

PART 2 - RISK ANALYSIS, MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND REPORTING

PART 2 - Section I. Summary of HMP Changes

Has the Applicant previously submitted a HMP Part 2 that is currently in use in the proposed Project Area? (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Table 1 - Summary of HMP Changes

Changes from Previous Year	Section Where Change Occurs
No Changes	No Changes

PART 2 - Section II - Special Status Species

Table 2 - Table of All Special-Status Species and Any Other Species of Local Concern That Were Considered for Inclusion in the HMP

Species	Listing Status	Habitat	Potential for Occurrence	Addressed by HMP? If not explain why?

PART 2 - Section III - Map(s) of Project Area

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 3

Table 3 - Data (Including Baseline Data) and Management Program for Species and/or Sensitive Habitats

Species/Habitat	Known Information	Methodology	Concerns / Risks / Uncertainties	Management Objective(s)	Management Action(s)	Success Criteria

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 4

Table 4: Summary of HMP Monitoring Program

Species/Habitat	Change Detection Methodology	Effectiveness Monitoring Methodology, Including Triggers	Identify Any Applicable Validation Monitoring (Focused Studies)

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 5

Table 5. Management Review and Response; Adaptive Management

Monitoring Methodology	How Monitoring Information Will Inform Management	How Data Will Be Analyzed	Management Response to Identified Triggers	Who Will Plan Management Response

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 6

Table 6: Previous Year's Monitoring Results

Monitoring Accomplishments	Results	Were Objectives and Success Criteria Achieved?
INF 2008 General OHV Monitoring: Routes were monitored for soil impacts and road conditions. Routes were rated as green, yellow or red for improvement priority.	237 miles of primary OHV routes were monitored and rated as red, yellow or green. An additional 1500 miles of secondary OHV routes were patrolled within the 10 OHV areas.	Yes.
INF 2008-2009 General OSV Monitoring: Groomed trail system was monitored for resource damage and compliance with area closures.	All 130 miles of groomed snowmobile trail were patrolled at least twice each week. Open riding areas were patrolled weekly. No evidence of vehicle/animal collisions was detected. Grooming began on December 26, 2008 and continued until March 27, 2009.	Yes.

Habitat Management Program (HMP) for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
 Agency: USFS - Inyo National Forest
 Application: General Application Requirements

<p>Sage Grouse: Assessed status of all roads leading to leks in Long Valley during late-February/early-March. All known leks were monitored a minimum of four times during breeding season to assess grouse population size. Population censusing was accomplished in cooperation with California Department of Fish and Game, Bureau of Land Management and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.</p>	<p>The winter of 2008-2009 was slightly below average in terms of total precipitation, with Mammoth Pass snow sensors recording approximately 90% of normal on April 1. Despite the nearly normal snowfall, OSV use in the vicinity of sage grouse leks was negligible. This is likely due to the fact that the primary routes into Long Valley are now plowed by the county and no longer suitable for use by OSVs. Lek counts began on March 19, 2009. At that time, approximately 200 birds were recorded. Peak attendance was recorded on April 2, 2009 when a total of 325 birds were detected. Grouse numbers on leks were not statistically different from those recorded during 2008 counts. No OHV/OSV use was detected on or near leks during strutting season. Due to low snow conditions, the Owens River Road (a county maintained road on LADWP land) was easily accessible to all types of vehicles. Vehicles were observed utilizing this road in close proximity to strutting grouse. No grouse were observed.</p>	<p>Yes. Monitoring was accomplished and no vehicle-related disturbance was detected at leks.</p>
<p>Mountain Yellow-legged Frog: Cow Creek bridge was assessed by Forest Fisheries Biologist and numerous times by OHV patrol personnel.</p>	<p>The bridge continues to function as designed and OHV use is not occurring in Cow Creek within occupied yellow-legged frog habitat. Population monitoring identified a sharp decline in overall numbers. California Department of Fish and Game personnel attribute the decline to chytrid fungus, possibly carried by aquatic macroinvertebrates.</p>	<p>Yes. Motor vehicle use is not negatively impacting mountain yellow-legged frogs.</p>
<p>Northern Goshawk: OSV patrol personnel visited all PACs within open riding areas during late-March 2009. All known nest territories within OHV use areas were monitored at least once during summer 2008.</p>	<p>Access to PACs was marginal during March, 2009 due to patchy snow conditions. No off-trail riding was detected within PACs. No OSV use was detected within core nesting areas. Summer-time monitoring indicated that territory occupancy rates were approximately 50%, consistent with previous years' data.</p>	<p>Yes. Monitoring was accomplished and no disturbance of goshawk nesting activity was detected.</p>

Bald Eagle: Journey level biologist and OSV/OHV patrol personnel monitored off-trail riding within known eagle winter roosts along the "A" trail and within 1/4-mile of the active nest site.	No off-trail riding was detected for the fourth consecutive year. No off-road travel was detected within 1/4-mile of the known bald eagle nest. The active nest successfully fledged young for the fourth consecutive year in 2008. As of 4/24/09 a female bald eagle was again incubating eggs.	Yes. Monitoring was accomplished and no off-trail travel occurred in eagle roosting habitat or within 1/4-mile of the active nest.
Mono Milkvetch 2008: Density monitoring conducted in 3 populations (5 plots); vigor monitoring conducted in 1 population (2 plots).	4 of 5 plots showed no significant change or a slight increase in density; Big Sand Flat outside exclosure plot showed a potential decline; vigor measures higher in Smokey Bear plot 1, no change in Smokey Bear plot 2.	Yes in most areas. Previous year's route closures in Smokey Bear Flat reducing area of trespass (observations). Big Sand Flat population outside exclosure may be declining.
July Gold 2008: Shelf Canyon ocular observations.	No off road trespass observed.	Yes.
Approximately 36 miles of non-system routes were surveyed for rare plants.	19 routes were identified that intersect sensitive plant populations in OHV management areas.	Varies by route.
Monitoring Task Checklist: Reviewed checklist monthly to develop patrol schedule and document completion of tasks.	Checklist was utilized and completed in a timely fashion. For OHV use during the spring-fall of 2008 completed 31 of 41 tasks identified. The remaining tasks not accomplished were primarily associated with monitoring individual rare plant species as this monitoring is scheduled for alternate years. For OSV use during the winter of 2008-2009 completed 9 of 16 tasks. The 7 tasks not accomplished were not applicable, as restricted riding areas were not deemed necessary.	Yes.
Off-road Documentation Form and Incident Reports: Maintained records of off-road use and remediation action taken.	All instances of off-road travel were documented (incident reports) as well as the remedial action taken (tracks raked, citation issued, etc.). This information was entered into LEIMARS, the Forest Service database of record for law enforcement incidents. Information regarding the location and type of off-road use was conveyed to botanists, biologists, soil scientists and hydrologists for assessment.	Yes. The Forest identified a need for a more rigorous protocol for transmitting data between law enforcement personnel and Forest staff. To remedy this, the Inyo will conduct annual refresher training with scientists and OHV patrol personnel.

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 7

Table 7: Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results

Management Actions	Species/ Habitat	Date Completed or Planned - mm/dd/yyyy	Changes Needed to HMP
The Inyo National Forest is in the latter stages of completing a Travel Management Plan for the entire Forest. A draft environmental impact statement has been published and the effects of adding non-system routes to the National Forest Transportation System are analyzed. A decision will be made whether to add or close routes, or add routes after existing resource issues have been mitigated. Recommendations for route addition or closure were based on a balance between resource protection and public access.	Various habitats, various species.	12/31/2009	Numerous opportunities for changes are identified in the draft EIS. These changes include mitigation of known resource issues, publishing a Motor Vehicle Use Map to refine the transportation system and expanding the WHPP/HMP to cover areas outside the 9 existing OHV use areas. Implementation of the final decision will require extensive work to delineate the desired transportation system on the ground.
Designed and implemented initial phase of restoration work in Deadman/Hartely/Glass area through restoration grant G07-02-05-R01. Installed barriers to prevent trail widening and route proliferation. Additional planning and implementation will continue through 2010.	Northern goshawk, American marten/mature forest.	09/30/2008	None.

Yellow-rated trail segment in the Bristlecone area was treated through the Crooked Creek Conservation Project (OR-2-1-80). Armored 12 stream crossings on the Crooked Creek Road to protect streambanks. Additional stabilization work is scheduled for summer 2009, in addition to monitoring of restoration efforts.	Greater sage-grouse.	09/30/2008	None.
During 2007-2008 work continued in the Monache area under Restoration grant OR-2-1-76. Six headcuts were stabilized and armored along the Monache single track trail and gully check structures were installed. An additional headcut was also treated near the Monache jeep trail creek crossing. Additional work is planned for summer 2009.	American marten, grey-leaved violet.	08/31/2008	None.

Work continued in the Inyo Mountains under Restoration Grant OR-2-1-81. Approximately 1.5 miles of unauthorized trail were obliterated in designated wilderness near Barrel Springs. Fourteen additional sites were barricaded and signed to prevent wilderness trespass. Stream flow captured by an OHV trail was returned to the natural channel. Restored areas were treated to prevent spread of invasive plant species. Monitoring of restoration work will occur during summer 2009.	General forest, various species.	09/30/2008	None.
Environmental surveys were completed and NEPA analysis initiated in preparation for restoration work in Silver Canyon (Grant G07-02-05-C03), Wyman Canyon (Grant G07-02-05-C02) and Olancho (Grant G07-02-05-R02).	Panamint alligator lizard/general forest/riparian.	12/31/2010	None.
Throughout the 9 OHV areas as well as the remainder of the Inyo NF, vehicle tracks off the established road system were raked and documented. Routine tread maintenance and erosion control work was performed. Patrol personnel installed and replaced directional and regulatory signage and made public contacts for educational purposes and to check for spark arrestors and green stickers.	Mono milkvetch, Mono Lake lupine, general forest, various species.	10/15/2008	None.

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 8

Table 8 Management Actions Taken in Response to HMP-related Public Concerns

Concern Raised by Public	Actions Taken to Address the Concern
None.	None.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700251

A. Soil Conservation

- a. Do any of your proposed projects involve Ground Disturbing Activities? (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

B. Soil Conservation Plan

Attachments:

[Soil Conservation Plan](#)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700251

A. Public Notification Efforts

Check all that apply: (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Notice to interested Parties/Groups (Enter date in mm/dd/yyyy format) [03/04/2009]
- ☒ Published on Applicant's Website (Enter date in mm/dd/yyyy format) [03/04/2009]
- ☐ Published in Newspaper
- ☒ News Release Issued
- ☒ Public Meeting(s) Hearing(s) Held

B. Public Comments

The Forest received four comments, which are summarized below. Overall support for the Inyo National Forest's grant application was expressed through three of the four letters, and during discussions at the OHV Leadership Forum meeting on March 30, 2009 in Bishop, CA.

GENERAL APPLICATION

1. There are discrepancies in regard to Visitor Use Numbers. "The previous and current grant request show a dramatically different amount of OHV visitors as compared to the recent Travel Management DEIS recently released."

GROUND OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

1. Abandon the traditional use of "focus areas". Motorized use occurs across the Forest, and is not just limited to these "focus areas". Consider applying for funding Forest-wide.

GROUND OPERATIONS - ROUTE SIGNING

1. Consider public input during the development of the "sign atlas".
2. The Forest should also consider improving the current portal sign kiosks at key entry points with updated interpretive information, quality maps, and regulatory information.
3. Consider sign needs for the implementation of Travel Management, as well as the creation of new Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers.

RESTORATION - FOREST PROJECTS

1. The Forest should anticipate using these funds for projects related to the recently created Wilderness areas, as well as on the ground implementation of the Travel Management decision and MVUM.

EDUCATION AND SAFETY

1. The development of the CTUC trail maps is more appropriate under the Ground Operations category. The CTUC maps should be moved from the Education and Safety category to the Ground Operations and Maintenance project.
2. Improve current portal kiosk signage across the Forest. The signage should be updated with site-specific natural and cultural information, as well as positive regulatory messages and maps.

C. Application Development as a result of Public Comments

- a. Were changes made to the Application as a result of public comments? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)

- b. Describe how public comments affected the Application

Most of the comments provided general support for the grant application package, however some of the comments required clarification to the project description. Minor edits were incorporated into several of the projects. The only significant change to the application involved moving the development and production of the CTUC maps from the Education and Safety category to the Ground Operations and Maintenance project.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700251

1. Applicant Certifications

A. General Conditions

- A. The Applicant hereby certifies, under the penalty of perjury, compliance with the following ☒ terms and conditions:
1. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees to monitor the condition of soils and wildlife in the Project Area each year in order to determine whether the soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to Public Resource Code (PRC), Section 5090.35 and the HMP prepared pursuant to Section 5090.53(a) are being met.
 2. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees that, whenever the soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to PRC Section 5090.35 is not being met in any portion of a Project Area, the recipient shall close temporarily that noncompliant portion, to repair and prevent accelerated erosion, until the same soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to PRC Section 5090.35 is met.
 3. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees that, whenever the HMP prepared pursuant to PRC Section 5090.53(a) is not being met in any portion of a Project Area, the recipient shall close temporarily that noncompliant portion until the same HMP prepared pursuant to PRC Section 5090.53(a) is met.
 4. The Applicant agrees to enforce the registration of off-highway motor vehicles and the other provisions of Division 16.5 (commencing with Section 38000) of the Vehicle Code and to enforce the other applicable laws regarding the operation of off-highway motor vehicles.
 5. The Applicant agrees to cooperate with appropriate law enforcement entities to provide proper law enforcement at and around the Facility.
 6. The Applicant's Project is in accordance with local or federal plans and the strategic plan for OHV Recreation prepared by the OHMVR Division.

B. Programmatic Conditions

B. The Applicant must describe the following programmatic conditions:

1. Identify the potential for the facility to reduce illegal and unauthorized OHV Recreation activities in the surrounding areas:

The Inyo National Forest provides year around OHV recreation opportunities, and management of a sustainable program is an essential part of the program of work for Forest Service staff. The continued presence on the ground to perform trail maintenance activities, improve directional signing, and enforce regulations has resulted in a reduction of illegal and unauthorized OHV recreation activities in the surrounding areas by maintaining and enhancing the OHV opportunities on the Inyo NF. During the past 10 years, a more integrated approach to managing OHV recreation has resulted in an improvement in resource conditions, and has led to a more sustainable OHV program that should continue to provide OHV recreation opportunities on public lands. This grant application includes improved efforts at signing and visitor information through maps as part of the Forest's effort to ensure facilities meet the needs of recreating public while protecting the resources.

2. Describe how the Applicant is meeting the operations and maintenance needs of any existing OHV Recreation Facility under its jurisdiction:

The OHV recreation facilities that are managed by the Inyo National Forest include, roads and trails, and developed campgrounds. Routine road and trail maintenance and the developed campground operations and maintenance are performed by seasonal employees and volunteers. Maintenance of roads and trails and campground facilities that are more than routine in nature are performed through the Forest's Engineering program, which maintains facilities to meet federal standards. In addition to State funded grants, the Forest utilizes funding from special use permit authorities, allocated funding, cooperative agreements, and volunteers to manage OHV recreation facilities under its jurisdiction.

C. Fee Collection

Describe how fees collected pursuant to Section 38230 of the Vehicle Code (in-lieu funds) are utilized and whether the fees complement the Applicant's proposed Project:

D. Compliance with PRC 5090.50(b)(1)(C)

Projects within the O&M category that affect lands identified as inventoried roadless areas by the U.S. Forest Service, are compliant with PRC 5090.50(b)(1)(C). (Please select Yes or No)

☒ Yes ☐ No

2. Governing Body Resolution

3. Land Manager Authorization

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700251

1. OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary

1 OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary

- a. Does the land manager agency provide legal OHV riding opportunity? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)

Starting (Month/Year) 10/2005 Ending (Month/Year) 09/2006

- b. Off-Highway Vehicle Opportunity Ratio (OHV Ratio) opportunity
- i. Months of OHV Opportunity (OHV Months) 12
- ii. Total Miles Of Routes Available For OHV Recreation 2875
- iii. Total Acres Of Open Riding Available For OHV Recreation 1100
- iv. OHV Visitation (visitor days) 627470
- v. Ratio of OHV Visitation/OHV Opportunity 157.85

1 OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary (2)

- c. Reference Document that support the responses to a. and b. on previous page
 2006 National Visitor Use Monitoring Results (Combination of activities information and questions on use of facilities which can be directly attributed to OHV use).
- d. Visitor Opportunity Ratio (V/O Ratio) = OHV Ratio x OHV Months / 12 157.85
 Visitor Opportunity Ratio (V/O Ratio) Score 4

2. Quality of OHV Opportunity

Land Manager's OHV program 10

Check all that apply (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Map with OHV Recreation opportunities clearly shown is available for distribution at no cost (2 points)
- ☒ Map with OHV Recreation opportunities clearly shown is available on the Land Manager's website (2 points)
- ☒ Map indicates relative difficulty of each OHV trail (2 points)
- ☒ Map indicates appropriate OHV use type (ATV, dirt bike, 4x4, OSV, etc.) (2 points)
- ☒ At least fifty percent of the staging areas include support facilities (restrooms, picnic tables, trash cans, shade structures) (2 points)
- ☐ Majority of trail intersections are signed with information such as: trail names, directional signs, relative difficulty, mileage to next feature (2 points)

3. Variety of OHV Opportunity

- a. Skill levels (e.g., beginner, intermediate, advanced) indicated by publicly available maps or signage marking trails with relative difficulty 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 3 or more skill levels (5 points) ☐ 2 skill levels (3 points)
- ☐ 1 skill level (1 point) ☐ Land Manager has no legal OHV riding opportunity (No points)

- b. Type of OHV Opportunity (ATV, dirt bike, 4x4, OSV, RUV, Sand Rail/Dune Buggy) 6

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Opportunities for 3 or more vehicle types (6 points)
- ☐ Opportunities for 2 vehicle types (3 points)
- ☐ Opportunity for only 1 vehicle type (1 point)
- ☐ Land Manager has no legal OHV riding opportunity (No points)

4. Agency Contribution

Cost of OHV Program for Land Manager's most recent complete fiscal year (not to include cost of indirect overhead): 1819200

% Funded by OHV Trust Fund (do not include in-lieu funds): 1

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No OHV Trust Funds were used (6 points)
- ☐ 10% or less of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (4 points)
- ☐ 11% to 25% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (3 points)
- ☒ 26% to 50% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (1 point)
- ☐ More than 50% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (No points)

Reference Document

FY08 PWP analysis of OHV costs.

5. Project Performance

For Applicant's OHV grant Projects which reached the end of the Project performance period within the last two years, the percentage of all deliverables accomplished 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 100% of Deliverable accomplished (5 points)
- ☐ 75% to 99% of Deliverables accomplished (3 points)
- ☐ Less than 75% of Deliverables accomplished (No points)
- ☐ First time Applicants and past Applicants with no active Grant projects within the last two years (2 points)

6. Previous Year Performance

In the previous year the Applicant has been responsive and communicated effectively with the assigned OHMVR Grant Administrator by phone, email or personal visit. 3

FOR DIVISION USE ONLY (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ In the previous year the Applicant has been responsive and communicated effectively with the assigned OHMVR Grant Administrator by phone, email or personal visit (3 points)
- ☐ First time Applicants and past Applicants with no active Grant projects within the last two years (2 points)
- ☐ In the previous year the Applicant has not been responsive (No points)

7. Prevention of OHV trespass

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Fence (Page 1)

- a. Is site a completely fenced facility such that OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas is prevented? 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ No (answer items b and c)
- ☐ Yes (10 points, explain and then skip to item 8)

Explain 'Yes' response:

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Patrol (Page 2)

- b. The majority of OHV Opportunity areas are patrolled (Check the one most appropriate) 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ At least 5 days per week (5 points)
☐ At least once per week (3 points)
☐ At least once per month (1 point)
☐ Less than once per month (No points)

Explain patrol efforts (e.g., frequency of patrol, patrol personnel, percent of lands covered by patrols)

Throughout the frontcountry of the Inyo National Forest, Law Enforcement Officers (LEO), Forest Protection Officers (FPO), and Recreation Technicians patrol developed and dispersed areas and make public contacts, and provide information about OHV opportunities, public safety, protection of resources, and OHV enforcement. The Forest has 5 LEOs (one per Ranger District and one in the Supervisors Office), with coverage 7 days per week (year around). The North Zone (Mammoth and Mono Lake Ranger Districts) has at least 3 FPOs/Recreation Technicians patrolling during the spring/summer/fall months and 1 FPO/Recreation Technicians during the winter months as part of the OSV program. The South Zone (White Mountain and Mount Whitney Ranger Districts) has 2 FPOs/Recreation Technicians that patrol during the spring/summer/fall months, and 1 FPO that patrols during the winter months (year around OHV program). The OHV/OSV opportunity areas are patrolled at least 5 days per week throughout the year.

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Measures (Page 3)

- c. Measures to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas 5

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Barriers and/or signing are used to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas (3 points)
☒ Education programs, maps and/or brochures provided to the public address OHV trespass, including respect for private property (2 points)

Explain measures utilized to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas

Resource protection has been a key component of the Inyo National Forest's OHV/OSV programs. Personnel are actively monitoring areas of concern, and take action where issues such as route proliferation and trespass into closed areas are beginning to occur. Public education, installation and maintenance of signage, raking out tracks, and enforcement are a major part of the duties performed by the OHV/OSV patrols. In addition, the Inyo National Forest has an active conservation and restoration program. Where resource issues have been identified that are larger in scope and scale than routine maintenance activities, numerous conservation and restoration projects (planning and implementation) have been completed to address these issues. These projects include obliterating closed routes, installing barriers, and signage. Specific attention is paid to private lands, and the Forest has been actively working with LA Department of Water and Power on routes where much of the illegal OHV activity originates.

8. OHV Education

8 OHV Education - Page 1

- a. Education materials available onsite 10

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Free literature is provided to visitors describing safe and responsible OHV recreational practices (5 points)
☒ Bulletin boards, signs or kiosks, at the majority of staging areas, trailheads, or other areas where the public gathers provide information concerning safe and responsible OHV Recreation (5 points)

- b. Applicant or Land Manager provides formal programs, educational talks, school field trips, etc. to the public to educate them on safe and responsible OHV recreational practices: 1

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 50 or more per year (3 points) ☐ 20 to 49 times per year (2 points)
☒ 5 to 19 times per year (1 point) ☐ Less than 5 times per year (No points)

8. OHV Education - Page 2

- c. When Facility is open, staff are available at trailheads, visitor centers and/or entrance stations to provide information on safe and responsible OHV use 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Daily (5 points) ☐ On all weekends (4 points)
☐ On the majority of weekends (2 points) ☐ On major holidays (1 point)
☐ None of the above (No points)

- d. ATV Safety Institute and/or Motorcycle Safety Foundation approved training courses are offered 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Weekly (3 points) ☐ Monthly (1 point)
☒ Less frequently than monthly (No points)

Describe Land Manager's onsite education efforts:

The Forest provides information and education about safe and responsible OHV use through patrols (see criteria 7), interagency visitor centers, and partnerships with local agencies and organizations. The Forest has 4 interagency visitor centers located at major entry points which disseminate information about OHV opportunities and safe and responsible OHV use. Staff is trained and available 7 days per week during most of the year at each of the visitor centers to answer questions and disseminate information. Free maps and brochures are available, such as "Motor Touring the Eastern Sierra" (cooperative effort with multiple agencies/organizations), OSV opportunity map (cooperative effort with the Town of Mammoth Lakes), and the Forest motorized vehicle use maps. Books and maps are also available for purchase. Education is emphasized through volunteer projects (avg. 100 hrs/month), and during organized OHV events (10+/year) and permitted operations.

9. Website

- a. OHV outreach efforts are accomplished through the Land Manager's website 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (skip to question 10) ☒ Yes (provide URL address and answer item b)

Provide URL address www.fs.fed.us/r5/inyo

- b. The Land Manager's website contains the following items 5

(Check all that apply) - Scoring: 1 point each up to a maximum of 5 points. (Please select applicable values)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Map to location | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hours of operation | <input type="checkbox"/> Safety information |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visitor facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contact information | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> News releases |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information on responsible riding | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Map of Facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Fee schedule |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Seasonal restrictions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Link to Division Website | <input type="checkbox"/> Law enforcement contact information |

10. OHV Outreach

Check all forms of OHV outreach the Applicant utilizes: 3

Scoring: 1 point each up to a maximum of 3 points. (Please select applicable values)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Billboards | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CDs and/or DVDs |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community meetings | <input type="checkbox"/> OHV dealers |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fairs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> News releases |

☒ Other (specify) [Motocross Events]

☐ Television

☐ Parades

☒ Radio

☐ Programs at schools

11. Natural and Cultural Resources

11. Natural and Cultural Resources - Page 1

- a. Is the Land Manager's OHV area a completely fenced track facility with little or no native vegetation?
0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ No (answer item b)

☐ Yes (5 points, explain and then skip to item 12)

Explain 'Yes' response

11. Natural and Cultural Resources - Page 2

- b. Resource Management Information System 5

Does the Land Manager maintain a management information system managed by qualified environmental staff that identifies and monitors the impacts of the OHV activity and contains at least the following:

- Ongoing survey/inventory of species
- Ongoing survey/inventory of archeological sites
- Biological monitoring that measures changes in populations
- Components that evaluate the effects of OHV recreation and related activity on the species;
- Recommendations for improvement in species management
- Strategies to respond to changing conditions that affect the survival or reproduction of species? (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Reference Document

Wildlife Habitat Protection Program (WHPP)/Habitat Management Program (HMP) for the 10 OHV/OSV Use Areas (dated September 11, 2007); Travel Management Draft EIS, Biological Assessment/Evaluation for plants and wildlife, and Heritage Resource Report; wildlife, plant, and heritage survey records; and Forest GIS database that contains plant and wildlife species occurrence information, and documented heritage resource sites.

12. Soil Management

12. Soil Management - Page 1

- a. Land Manager has developed a systematic methodology for evaluating soil conditions of its OHV Opportunities? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response OHV patrols use Soil Condition Evaluation Forms to note any soil condition deviations from Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Standards. Most field going personnel have been trained in monitoring protocols and standards.

- b. Land Manager has developed methods to address soil issues? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response Through ongoing monitoring efforts, the Forest has proactively identified and addressed soil issues through implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), regular maintenance, and implementation of conservation and restoration projects. Examples of regular maintenance includes re-grading roads, cleaning culverts, and constructing and improving water bars. Examples of conservation and restoration projects include selective route closure (blocking and restoring to natural conditions), barrier enhancement and signage, and improving stream crossings (bridge placement and hardening the crossing through rock placement). In addition, maintenance and installation of signage, raking out tracks, and enforcement are part of the routine duties of the FPO/Recreation Technician patrols.

12. Soil Management - Page 2

- c. Land Manager performs soil monitoring 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ Monthly (3 points)

☐ After major rain events (2 points)

☐ Annually (No points)

13. Sound Level Testing

The Applicant or Land Manager conducts, or causes to be conducted, sound level testing 2

(Check only one if applicable) (Please select one from list)

☐ On most (50% or more) holidays and weekends (4 points)

☒ At least 25% but less than 50% of holidays and weekends (2 points)

☐ Less than 25% of holidays and weekends (No points)

Describe the sound testing program

Random spot checks are conducted throughout the Forest and at organized or permitted events. The Forest has sound testing equipment and certified sound testers.